

REMARKS*Claim Rejection under 35 USC § 102*

Claims 14-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by United States Patent No. 6,397,145, issued to Millington in 2002.

Applicants' navigation system displays a first GUI screen that includes the location of the vehicle. Applicants' system also formulates a second GUI screen that does not include the location of the vehicle. The user, by suitable input, has the option of displaying the second GUI screen. In this manner, the user can review a portion of the route that has been traveled already or anticipate future directions.

Millington only displays the GUI screen that includes the maneuver or instruction that is currently being executed by the vehicle. In Fig. 2, vehicle icon 52 represents the current position of the vehicle, col. 4, lines 12-16, and the system displays the current position of the vehicle, col. 3, lines 17-19. Nowhere in Millington is there contemplated a display that does not include the instruction that is then being executed by the vehicle.

The rejection points to Figs. 4 and 5 in Millington. Millington describes that, when a complex maneuver is approaching, the CPU switches the display from the view in Fig. 2 to the view in Fig. 4, col. 5, lines 17-20. As can be seen in Fig. 2, at the time of the switch to Fig. 4, the vehicle is currently executing the instruction 70' that includes maneuver A. Thus, the display includes the route segment on which the

vehicle is located. When the user completes the first maneuver instruction 70', the first maneuver instruction disappears, and only instruction 70'' remains, col. 5, lines 60-63. With regard to Fig. 5, the system shifts the display to Fig. 5 *while the vehicle 21 is in the process of completing the second maneuver instruction 70''*, col. 6, lines 41-45. Thus, the display in Fig. 5 includes the route segment with the then-current position of the vehicle.

Millington is adapted to show a complex maneuver that includes more than one maneuver or instruction. However, Millington does not allow the user to display a view that does not include the instruction and maneuver that is then being executed. Thus, Millington does not allow the user to render a second GUI screen that does not include the location of the vehicle, as called for in claim 21, or the identified route segment on which the vehicle is located, as called for in claim 14.

Furthermore, in Millington, the CPU determines that GUI screen that is displayed. The CPU switches the display from Fig. 2 to Fig. 4, col. 5, lines 17-20. Then, later, the CPU switches the display to Fig. 5 after the vehicle completes instruction 70' and is executing instruction 70''. Nothing in Millington contemplates input from the user to show a display other than the display determined by the CPU. Thus, Millington is not configured to receive user input and display a second GUI screen in response, as called for in claims 14 and 21.

Claim 14 is directed to Applicants' navigation system that includes a processor-based subsystem that displays a first or a second GUI screen. The first GUI screen includes an identified route segment on which the vehicle is located, which

might be viewed similar to the display in Millington. However, the claim also calls for a second GUI screen does not include the identified route segment. Nowhere in Millington is it contemplated to show a screen that does not include the route segment with the current instruction or maneuver. In accordance with the claim, the system renders the second GUI screen in response to user input. In the Millington system, the CPU determines the displayed view, and the view that is displayed includes the instruction, i.e., segment, on which the vehicle is located. Millington does not allow the user to change the display to a second screen that does not include the instruction or maneuver that is currently being executed. When Fig. 4 is displayed, Millington does not provide an option to view Fig. 5 to anticipate the next maneuver. After maneuver A is completed, and the CPU determines to display Fig. 5, the user of the Millington system cannot again view Fig. 4. Thus, Millington is not configured to receive user input and render a second GUI screen that does not include the identified route segment on which the vehicle is located, and so does not anticipate or even suggest Applicants' invention in claim 14.

Claims 15-20 are dependent upon claim 14 and not taught or suggested by Millington for the reasons set forth with regard to that claim.

Claim 21 is directed to Applicants' navigation system, which, like claim 14, is configured to receive user input and display a second GUI screen that does not include the location of the vehicle. For the reasons above, Millington is limited to displaying only the view that includes the current maneuver or instruction, as determined by the CPU. Millington does not allow the user to switch views and so does not teach or suggest Applicant's claim 21, or dependent claims 22-26.

From the above, it is clear that Applicants' invention is readily distinguishable from Millington. The rejection may be interpreting the wording of the claims in a manner not intended by Applicants. If the Examiner feels that the wording of the claims might be made clearer, Applicants would appreciate any suggestion or proposal by the Examiner for changes that might alleviate the Examiner's concerns, and the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned at the phone number provided.


Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of the claims based upon Millington be reconsidered and withdrawn, and that claims 14-26 be allowed.

Conclusion

It is believed, in view of the amendments and remarks herein, that all grounds of rejection of the claims have been addressed and overcome, and that all claims are in condition for allowance.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees associated with this communication to Deposit Account No. 50-0831.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Douglas D. Fekete", is written over a horizontal line.

Douglas D. Fekete
Reg. No. 29,065
Delphi Technologies, Inc.
Legal Staff – M/C 480-410-202
P.O. Box 5052
Troy, Michigan 48007-5052

(248) 813-1210